

Alachua County Public Schools

Glen Springs Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Glen Springs Elementary School

2826 NW 31ST AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/glensprings>

Demographics

Principal: Ricky Bell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Glen Springs Elementary School

2826 NW 31ST AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/glensprings>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Glen Springs Elementary School is to academically enrich all of our students and foster social skills to promote successful lifelong learners in a caring, safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Glen Springs Elementary is that all students will leave our school with

- the skills needed to be successful citizens
- a strong self-esteem
- high expectations
- respect for others
- and a desire to continue the quest for knowledge

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Feagin, Deanna	Principal	Principal serves as the instructional leader and practices shared decision making by: Assessing, evaluating, and monitoring specific and measurable goals for the instructional and learning needs of the school, teachers and students. She practices shared decision making by encouraging faculty and staff members to communicate with the leadership team, work collaboratively to plan meaningful and aligned lessons and activities; as well as, analyze data.
Armstrong, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselor serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: Provides Response to Intervention coordination across grade levels, leads and manages student Individual Educational Plans/ 504s and Educational Planning team meetings. Support for content area and grade level teachers in understanding progress monitoring strategies within multiple measures of data collected.
Zinger, Mary	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader and practices shared decision making by: Facilitating professional development learning for teachers that align with our school goals and needs of our students. Additionally, she also provides meaningful and specific evidence based feedback to teachers following informal classroom walk-through and evaluations. Lastly, she serves as a support for content area and grade level teachers in understanding and aligning the standards to instructional practice.
Logan, Nancy	Other	Title I and Florida Continuous Improvement Model Coordinator serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: providing remediation to students who, based on state assessment data, are in the lowest quartile in reading and math. She also facilitates data meetings across grade levels to engage in shared discussion about student growth and academic needs; as well as, targeted interventions.
Engram, LaRayne	Dean	Dean of Students serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: Providing professional development in the area of behavior management and specific

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		targeted interventions based on student needs. She also serves as the school based attendance liaison who is responsible for monitoring student attendance, facilitating educationally planning team meetings as it relates and communicating with the District truancy officer if needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/7/2017, Ricky Bell

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	65	55	60	52	57	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	5	4	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	86	77	76	79	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	10	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	4	12	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	3	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	86	77	76	79	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	10	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	4	12	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	3	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	59%	57%	58%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	60%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	49%	53%	42%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	60%	63%	62%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	62%	51%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	49%	51%	34%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	57%	53%	45%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	43%	55%	-12%	56%	-13%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	60%	2%	64%	-2%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	55%	-4%	53%	-2%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	33	33	31	48	36	38				
BLK	32	35	39	35	21	22	30				
HSP	60	57		71	62						
MUL	59	54		53	46						
WHT	68	59	40	76	64	46	66				
FRL	35	36	32	47	40	30	37				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	33	20	34	47						
BLK	38	40	27	55	44	29	24				
HSP	63	50		70	62						
MUL	50			53							
WHT	72	61	50	74	54	42	73				
FRL	49	51	45	57	44	32	42				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	27		46	41						
BLK	44	50	41	52	43	20	38				
HSP	45	50		55	42						
MUL	44	50		50	50						
WHT	71	70	54	72	57	40	68				
FRL	48	53	40	53	41	29	24				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance data component was the percentage of SWD who showed grade level proficiency in ELA. A factor that may have contributed to this gap is the lack of students' access of the curriculum (at their grade level).

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component from 2019 (since there was no FSA testing in 2020) that showed the greatest decline was economically disadvantaged students' grade level achievements and the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. Factors that contributed to this decline include absences, tardies and early checkouts.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math, lowest quartile. School - 32%, State - 51%, a difference of 19%. Our district's adopted resources do not fully address the complexity of the standards. This may have contributed to the decline in Math performance. Also, there was a gap in the students' knowledge of basic facts which directly impacts the students' ability to solve complex problems.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The most improvement was seen in 4th grade ELA achievement. We utilized materials to supplement our reading BASAL, such as FL Ready resources for ELA that more directly addressed the standards and provided the rigor and complexity to master the standard. We also implemented Title I services for second through fifth grade that included small group pull out and extended day instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Areas of concern shown on the EWS data include attendance and the number of students that scored a Level 1 on the statewide assessment in 2019.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Close the racial achievement gap in all areas.
2. Increase ELA achievement and learning gains for the lowest quartile.

3. Reduce the disproportionate rate of out of school suspension for African American students.
4. Increase student time in instructional setting.
5. Increase the achievement level and learning gains of SWD in ELA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Area of Focus is Closing the Achievement Gap of African American/Black Students and white students. Due to the fact that curriculum is presented at grade level, some African American/Black students performing below grade level have not mastered previous grade level curriculum. This need was identified in our ESSA data and school data. There is a gap of 36% and 41% respectively between ELA and math achievement levels. The federal index for our African American/Black students was 31% which is well below the target of 41%.

Measurable Outcome: The specific measurable outcome we will use is the 2021 FSA data for achievement levels in ELA and math. Our goal is to increase the percentage of African American/Black students' achievement level by 3% points. That would be 35% for ELA and 38% for math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Explicit communication of high expectations for all students
2. Engage all students in rigorous, standards-based curricula
3. Increase faculty's cultural competency
4. Small group instruction from Title 1
5. EDI twice a week in both ELA and math
6. Utilize research-based supplemental curriculums in ELA and math - Achieve 3000, Reading A-Z, Ready Florida, and Reflex Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All students are entitled to equity and excellence in their pursuit of an education and success in a career after high school. Through this area of focus, the school will work to close the achievement gap and foster learning outcomes that will help students achieve their postsecondary goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Establish a Professional Learning Community to increase teachers' cultural competencies through a book study using "We Got This: Equity, Access, and the Quest to Be Who Our Students Need Us to Be".
2. Utilize supplemental, standards-based reading curriculum, Ready Florida, Reading A-Z, Achieve 3000 for use during ELA small group, differentiated instruction and during Extended Day Instruction. For math use IXL and Reflex Math.
3. Teachers will use standard focused boards in a prominent place in their classroom to communicate high expectations for all students.

Person Responsible: Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Another Area of Focus is improving the Learning Gains of Students in the Lowest Quartile. The greatest gap between Glen Springs and the state average was in math with students in the lowest quartile. The school's average was 19% lower than the state. School - 32% and State - 51%. Students in the lowest quartile need additional support to make appropriate learning gains in ELA and math.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to have 45% of students in the lowest quartile make learning gains in ELA and 35% of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in math on the 2021 FSA. This would be a 3% increase over the data shown in the 2019 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nancy Logan (logannl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small group instruction from Title 1 2. Extended Day Instruction in ELA and math - 2 days a week 3. SIPPS small group intervention 4. UFLI small groups 5. Small-group and individual interventions 6. Frequent progress monitoring and data chats
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A year ago, the district purchased SIPPS resources for schools and provided training for teachers. Our goal is to assess all 3rd graders, targeted 4th and 5th graders to determine placement in SIPPS and then to provide small group intervention for students with identified reading deficiencies in phonics. This is our second year as a James Patterson Literacy School and teachers received training in UFLI small groups to address reading deficiencies in decoding and fluency. For math, teachers will monitor students progress and provide targeted interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement the district adopted curriculum and supplemental resources with fidelity.
2. Teachers will monitor the progress of their students using data from ISIP and AIMS in ELA and math.
3. Teachers will also review this data to select students for small group instruction and Extended Day Instruction.

Person Responsible Nancy Logan (logannl@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Another area of focus is to reduce disproportionate discipline data for African American/Black students. Data shows a strong connection between high suspension rates and poor educational outcomes. Research data shows that out of school suspensions have little to no impact on behavior. When possible, the school will develop and implement restorative practices and behavioral interventions to improve learning outcomes and reduce behavior challenges school-wide.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to reduce the number of out of school suspensions for African American/Black students by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: LaRayne Engram (engramim@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence based strategies being implemented for this Area of Focus include Glen Springs utilizing PBIS, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support, as well as restorative practices and social emotional learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies address student behavior through systems change resulting in improved social and academic outcomes and a reduction in out of school suspensions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Restorative Practice; In an effort to reduce the number of days out of school, Glen Springs will offer the program "In Lieu of" where students and the family participate in an hour long session that addresses the behavior for the suspension. The number of days out of school is reduced if the student and family completes the program.
2. PBIS. School wide positive behaviors and expectations are taught and modeled and school-family partnership is encouraged.
3. Three Tiers of Support. Classroom teachers will group students by behavioral needs and provide learning opportunities to meet the needs of each group. Tier 1 students are working "On level" and provided with supplemental information. Tier 2 students are "Approaching" and need additional support such as small group. Tier 3 students are below level and require intensive interventions that may include small group, one on one behavioral supports.

Person Responsible LaRayne Engram (engramim@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the Achievement of Economically Disadvantaged Students(EDS). In our 2019 data, our federal index for EDS was 37%, 4% below the 41% minimum federal index standard. There is a strong correlation between grade level proficiency and success in school and for career and college readiness.

Measurable Outcome: The goal is for the federal index for economically disadvantaged students to be at least 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Ongoing progress monitoring using AIMS and ISIP
2. Data chats to insure interventions are appropriate and demonstrate growth in targeted area
3. Extended Day Instruction
4. Title 1 small group intervention instruction
5. Evidence-based supplemental programs - IXL, Reflex Math, Achieve 3000, Ready Florida, Reading A-Z

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who are struggling to meet grade level proficiency need additional strategies and interventions in order to make achievement gains. They also need additional instructional time to promote growth in grade level achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1, Collect baseline data on students.
2. Analyze the data to determine which students would benefit from additional interventions or more instructional time.
3. Ongoing progress monitoring and data chats to evaluate the success of interventions and additional instructional time
4. Identify students for Extended Day Instruction.

Person Responsible Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of Focus - Increase learning gains and percentage of students achieving grade level proficiency in ELA. Students with disabilities often perform below grade level expectations. Closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities is necessary to ensure their success in school and beyond.

Measurable Outcome: ELA achievement level will increase from 22% to 25%. Learning gains will increase from 33% to 36%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deanna Feagin (feagindm@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Ongoing progress monitoring using AIMs and ISIP
2. ESE co-teach and support facilitation model
3. Evidence-based supplemental software - Istation, IXL, Achieve 3000
4. SIPPS and UFLI small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data is available that shows that students who are placed in the least restrictive environment benefit in several ways. The benefits include increased student achievement and better preparation for life after high school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement collaborative planning for ESE and regular education teachers who co-teach using the inclusion model.
2. Provide continued professional development on Universal Design for Learning strategies.
3. Provide inclusion training for any new inclusion teacher using district specialists.
4. Ongoing progress monitoring
5. Targeted interventions based on data.

Person Responsible: Deanna Feagin (feagindm@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The remaining area of focus is from data collected in our Early Warning System and has to do with the number of student absences. We also know that we have many tardies and early check outs. It's important for students to be present for all instructional time and that missed instructional time can affect student outcomes. This year, we are not emphasising being present in person due to the pandemic but we are working with families to have students attend our Digital Academy whenever they have to quarantine as long as their health allows. Interruptions to the instructional day will be minimized and only happen when necessary. SkyAlerts are sent to families encouraging them to schedule doctor and dental appointments on our early release Wednesdays. The BRT will schedule EPT meetings with the classroom teacher and the parent of a student who has excessive absences. Our Digital Academy teachers are proactive in reaching out to families of students who don't show up in the Zoom class or leave early. Their goal is to work cooperatively with the family to find solutions to the problem whether it's technology or motivation.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The Glen Springs Elementary Faculty and staff believe that positive parent and family involvement is essential to student achievement. We encourage and support active parent and family engagement in all school activities.

By openly communicating with families through phone calls, planners, newsletters, our Home-School Compact, and digital resources, teachers establish a culture of trust, respect, and high expectations for students. Teachers routinely offer flexible opportunities for parents to discuss their student's progress. On a school-wide level, administrators use a variety of means to create a positive school culture by keeping families up to date with Skyalert e-mails, newsletters, messages on our digital marquee, and birthday announcements and cards for students. We utilize personnel such as our technology specialist at the district level to guide us to employ school improvement strategies like our school-wide "parent tech night" or to work with small groups of teachers to impact students' enhanced use of technology. The members of our PTA are focused on providing support to teachers and students by sponsoring fundraisers to pay for school improvements and also to build a positive sense of community within the school. Our PTA plans several events throughout the year that brings together all of our stakeholders to create positive school culture. We involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs by inviting input from members of the PTA, the SAC, from responses to the School Climate Survey, and Parent Involvement Activity feedback forms.

We consult with various stakeholder groups from the community to employ school improvement strategies that impact school culture and environment. For example, our SAC committee, comprised of teachers, parents, and community members, plays a key role in planning for and monitoring school performance. We receive support materials and personnel from the University of Florida and the James Patterson Challenge to help teachers assess student learning and improve primary grade reading skills. Our business partners and community volunteers provide time and resources and participate in campus-wide activities for teachers and students along with various other programs including a food backpack program for students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$7,910.87
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,805.00
<i>Notes: Ready Florida Toolbox</i>						
	5100	520-Textbooks	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,591.25
<i>Notes: Ready Florida workbooks</i>						
	5100	520-Textbooks	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$736.00
<i>Notes: Great Leaps</i>						
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$778.62
<i>Notes: Faculty Book Study PLC</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$12,827.13
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$6,646.00
<i>Notes: Achieve 3000 web-based program</i>						
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,138.63
<i>Notes: Extended Day Intervention</i>						
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,042.50
<i>Notes: Intervention and RTI in the Classroom SD</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

			0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	General Fund		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: The funds will be used to purchase items from the PAWS store and to fund nine weeks event.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged				\$160,707.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,636.00
			<i>Notes: Reflex Math web-based program</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,418.90
			<i>Notes: Reading A-Z</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$155,652.10
			<i>Notes: Salaries for an Instructional Coach and 1 Intervention Teacher</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$20,855.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,025.00
			<i>Notes: UFLI Materials</i>			
	5100	110-Administrators	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$16,530.00
			<i>Notes: Principal Specialist</i>			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,300.00
			<i>Notes: Collaborative Planning Days PLC</i>			
Total:						\$202,800.00